

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

Thursday, October 11, 2001

Joe Serna, Jr., Building
(Cal-EPA Building)
Central Valley Auditorium
1001 I Street, Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Members Present

Reed Hastings, President
Susan Hammer, Vice President
Robert J. Abernethy
Donald Fisher
Erika Goncalves
Nancy Ichinaga
Marion Joseph
Vicki Reynolds
Suzanne Tacheny

Member Absent

Carlton J. Jenkins
Vacancy

Closed Session

The State Board met in Closed Session from 8:10 to 9:23 a.m.

Call to Order

President Hastings called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

Salute to the Flag

President Hastings invited Ms. Reynolds to lead the members, staff, and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Announcements/Communications

President Hastings reminded the State Board and the audience of the following changes in the day's agenda:

- Consideration of Item 33, proposed formation of the Mission San Jose Unified School District – which is scheduled for public hearing not before 10:00 a.m. – will not be taken up before 1:00 p.m., so that the State Board can first complete consideration and action on all assessment items.
- Item 34, recognition of the Presidential Award winners and nominees for science and mathematics teaching, will be a special order of business at approximately 11:15 a.m.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

Closed Session Report

Ms. Belisle reported that the State Board considered two matters in the closed session on this day:

(1) *Comité*. No action taken.

(2) *Chapman*. The State Board authorized counsel to request representation from the Attorney General's Office to take appropriate action to protect the interests of the State Board in *Chapman et al. v. California Department of Education, et al.*

ITEM 22	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Planning for the 2003 STAR Program.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Deputy Superintendent Paul Warren summarized where things currently stand in terms of the development of the STAR Program and the CDE staff proposal to divide into three separate contracts (1) the norm-referenced test (NRT) to replace the SAT-9 beginning in 2003; (2) continued development of the California Standards Tests and Golden State Exams; and (3) administration of STAR tests and reporting of STAR results. Considerable discussion followed.

Mr. Mockler suggested that the CDE recommendation should be kept in mind as the State Board addressed the items that follow this one. Ms. Tacheney suggested that too many contracts may pose just as many problems as a single contract. Superintendent Eastin reminded the members that, through Harcourt Educational Measurement (HEM), the state was in effect already using the services of many subcontractors and presumably HEM was taking a portion of the subcontractors' amounts as profit; the state probably would realize savings by dividing the contracts as proposed. Mr. Warren acknowledged that CDE was having difficulty recruiting personnel with the specific expertise needed to manage as complex an assessment system as we have in California; the salaries the state offers are not competitive.

Mrs. Joseph indicated that she was confused as to what was being asked of the State Board at this time. Mr. Mockler suggested that there are several important decisions to be made: (1) how to allocate the \$3 million in new federal funds for independent evaluation (Item 24); (2) the criteria for a new NRT (Item 23); and (3) whether to split up the STAR contract as proposed in this item. Ms. Tacheney indicated that she could not support a decision on splitting up the contracts at this time; the State Board does not have sufficient information to make an informed decision. Mrs. Joseph echoed that thought, but indicated that she was prepared to move ahead on allocation of the \$3 million and was prepared to make a motion in that regard.

Mr. Warren indicated that CDE staff would strongly recommend that a decision be made this day on splitting up the contract. He suggested that, if the State Board felt uncomfortable with three separate contracts, that CDE staff could support the idea of two contracts, one for the NTR and administration, the other for the CSTs and Golden State Exams. Ms. Tacheney reiterated her reservations about acting at this time; she suggested that the decision could be made on a provisional basis, subject to continued work by CDE staff, State Board staff, and the State Board testing liaisons.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

President Hastings expressed the view that it was important to keep the full Board involved in this critical decision on the future of the assessment system. Superintendent Eastin supported that thought, while, at the same time, expressing her appreciation of the liaisons' diligent work; this needs to be a full Board decision.

Mr. Mockler suggested that the time line for calling upon test publishers for submissions of a new NRT may be premature; informally several test publisher representatives have said that their new NRTs are not yet ready. Mrs. Joseph echoed that thought, saying that it was important to ensure that the State Board is positioned to make the best decision on a new NRT; the difference may be only a matter of a few months. Ms. Reynolds and Ms. Hammer agreed that it was important to have more information before deciding how to package the work for contracting purposes. Ms. Tacheny indicated that she could support a motion to allocate the federal funds (under Item 24), as long as it was clear that no RFP for the new NRT would go out between this meeting and the November 2001 meeting (in accordance with the time line indicated in this agenda item). There was consensus that no RFP would go out during this interim period between the two meetings. There was also consensus that CDE staff would prepare an analysis of the trade-offs related to a faster or slower time line for selection of a new NRT, and that input would be sought from representatives of major test publishers. With that, President Hastings moved ahead to Item 24 for purposes of a motion; then, action was taken on Item 23.

The discussion subsequently returned to this item. Ms. Tacheny reiterated the need to keep sight of the dual objectives of streamlining testing at the high school level and meeting the needs of CSU for placement in decisions relating to the CSTs and Golden State Exams. Mr. Mockler indicated that this needed to come back to the State Board at the November meeting with a revised time line. President Hastings echoed that thought, indicating that the November agenda item needed to take into account the implications of SB 233.

Ms. Joseph recalled Mr. Padia's comment of the preceding day that the CSTs might not be sufficiently reliable for CSU's purposes. She asked whether the number of items on the CSTs was adequate. Superintendent Eastin commented that the GSEs would provide many additional items. Mr. Warren provided his assurance that reliability of the CSTs will be adequate for CSU's purposes. Ms. Tacheny closed the discussion on this item by reiterating and clarifying the principal objectives of the state's assessment system.

ITEM 23	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Proposed Criteria for the Review of Norm-Referenced Test (NRT) Submissions.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	-----------------------

[Taken up following Item 24.]

Mr. Warren briefly summarized the matter presented in this item.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the criteria for review of norm-referenced tests in accordance with the recommendation of CDE staff. Ms.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

Hammer seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Abernethy was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 24	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Proposal to Use \$3 Million in Federal Funds for an Independent Evaluation Contractor.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

[Taken up following Item 22. See discussion above.]

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the plan for the use of federal funds for an independent evaluation contractor with the following changes:
 - (1) Any studies to be conducted must be reviewed by the expert panel. The studies must be an integral part of the long-term testing plan for California.
 - (2) Any RFP for the independent evaluation contractor will be developed in consultation with the State Board testing liaisons and State Board staff. If agreement cannot be reached on an RFP, it will be brought before the State Board.
 - (3) To the maximum extent possible, the independent evaluation contractor will assist the Department and the State Board in the development of the proposals for the NRT, CST, and the testing plan for 2003 and thereafter.

Mr. Abernethy seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

ITEM 25	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of 2002 Contract with Harcourt Educational Measurement.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Standards and Assessment Division Director Phil Spears briefed the State Board members on this item, presenting a revised contract and scope of work for their consideration. [Attachment 10.] Mr. Mockler inquired whether the Department of Finance (DOF) had approved the contract's costs in accordance with law. Upon being advised that DOF had not approved the costs, Mr. Mockler recommended that any motion to approve be made conditional on favorable action by DOF.

Ms. Belisle mentioned several areas of concern, including (1) the waiving of a requirement to qualify for student scholarships based on CST performance for certain students, (2) a provision that implies that extra funding will be provided for scoring grade four and seven writing assessment under certain conditions, (3) a provision allowing amendment of the scope of work with approval of the Executive Director if no additional costs are involved, and (4) the lack of a provision relating to a process to prepare for transition of the reading list function to a different vendor in 2003. Ms. Belisle described the problems that have arisen with the eligibility

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

requirement that all students take a standards-based mathematics test, even though the Governor's Scholarship Program is based on the students' Stanford 9 mathematics and English-language arts scores.

Ms. Belisle noted that the scope of work assumes for the 2001 scholarships that the State Board is exempting certain students from the mathematics standards test eligibility requirement. This change would allow high achieving students who are ahead of the traditional mathematics course sequence to participate in the Governor's Scholarship Program. She suggested that the State Board might want to consider following this course of action for the 2002 testing cycle as well. She clarified that this decision would not have any impact on the requirement that students take the appropriate tests. It would only impact the eligibility requirements for the scholarship.

- ACTION: Ms. Reynolds moved that the State Board (1) approve, subject to approval of costs by the Department of Finance, the 2002 contract and initial scope of work with Harcourt Educational Measurement, (2) adopt the 2001 Governor's Scholarship Program requirements for 2002, and (3) authorize the State Board's Executive Director to approve changes in the scope of work that may be necessary during the period of the contract and that do not increase the program costs or jeopardize meeting the program's statutory and regulatory requirements. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Abernethy was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 26	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of 2002 CTB/McGraw-Hill Contract for Spanish Assessment of Basic Education (SABE)/2.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	-----------------------

Mr. Spears made a brief presentation.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve, subject to approval of costs by the Department of Finance, the 2002 CTB/McGraw-Hill contract for SABE/2. Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

ITEM 27	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of English-Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and History-Social Science Performance Standards (Levels).	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	-----------------------

[Attachment 11, Announcement of Three Regional Hearings]

Mr. Spears made the initial presentation of the CDE recommendations on the performance standards (levels) and compared them to the recommendations of the content review panels in the various subject areas. He pointed out that CDE staff recommended against the State Board adopting performance standards (levels) for the CSTs for integrated mathematics and science courses. There is insufficient information on which to base performance standards (levels) for these tests. He also discussed the CDE recommendation for incorporating the writing assessment

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

at grades four and seven with a value of eight points, thus raising the total possible score at those grade levels to 98. Mr. Spears pointed out that it was not advisable to weight the writing assessment higher, because it is based on a single essay, and it is essentially impossible to maintain the same degree of difficulty in writing prompts from year to year.

Superintendent Eastin indicated her support for weighting the writing assessment at eight points. Ms. Reynolds indicated that, while understanding the reasons for the recommendation, she would be inclined to weight the writing assessment somewhat higher in order to help emphasize writing. Regardless of how the writing assessment is weighted, though, we need to communicate clearly the importance of writing in the curriculum. Ms. Goncalves indicated that it would be more beneficial if students could get their actual scored writing assessment back for study and review.

Mr. Fisher inquired as to how these performance standards (levels) were involved in decisions to promote students or hold them back.

Speaker
Sally Bennett

Ms. Bennett expressed the support of the Association of California School Administrators for a higher weighting of the writing assessment because it is the only performance based item on the CST. If it were to be weighted as 16 points, instead of eight, it would then constitute 15 percent of each student's score at these grade levels. She urged the State Board to send a strong educational message with its action.

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board, in keeping with the requirements of Education Code Section 60605(a)(3), approve the holding of regional public hearings on the proposed performance standards (levels) presented by CDE staff, specifically:
 - (1) For English-language arts, the performance standards (levels) used in 2001 are to remain the same for all grades except grades four and seven. For grades four and seven, the results of the direct writing assessment will be incorporated with a weight of eight points, bringing the total possible points at each of these grade levels to 98. The cut scores for grade four would be as follows: Far Below Basic (fewer than 29 correct responses), Below Basic (29), Basic (42), Proficient (65), and Advanced (78). The cut scores for grade seven would be as follows: Far Below Basic (fewer than 35 correct responses), Below Basic (35), Basic (49), Proficient (66), and Advanced (79). [It was understood that the consequence data for these proposed adjustments in the performance standards (levels) for grades four and seven are to be revised slightly by staff from what appears in the agenda consistent with information supplied by the test publisher.]
 - (2) For Mathematics, the performance standards (levels) are to be as displayed in the agenda, except that no performance standards (levels) are to be proposed for integrated mathematics courses because of insufficient information on which to base

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

them. [It was understood that the performance standards (levels) proposed for grade “11” in the agenda materials will be identified instead as the High School Summative Standards Test, because students in grades other than grade 11 may take this test under certain circumstances.

- (3) For History-Social Science, the performance standards (levels) are to be as displayed in the agenda.
- (4) For Science, the performance standards (levels) are to be as displayed in the agenda, except that no performance standards (levels) are to be proposed for integrated science courses because of insufficient information on which to base them.
- (5) The proposed performance standards (levels) are to be used in 2002 and thereafter. However, following the 2007 administration of the California Standards Tests, the performance standards (levels) are proposed to be re-evaluated to determine the feasibility of raising them.
- (6) The objective of having all students achieve at or above the Proficient performance standard (level), established in 2001 in relation to the English-language arts, is proposed to be continued for that subject area and expanded to all of the other subject areas for which performance standards (levels) are adopted.

Ms. Goncalves seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 8-1. Mr. Fisher voted against the motion.

[Following the conclusion of Item 27, the State Board proceeded to Item 34, then recessed for lunch.]

Lunch Break. 12:03 – 1:05 p.m.

ITEM 28	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of the California Standards Tests’ Sub-Score Reporting Categories.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Standards Office Administrator Robert Anderson presented the CDE recommendations for the reporting of sub-scores on the CSTs; he noted areas where the recommendations were endorsed by the content review panels and areas where additions or enhancements had been made after the panels had completed their work. There was discussion, particularly of the “extra cuts” proposed by CDE staff, some of which were based on fewer than 10 responses. Ms. Tacheny indicated that she could support providing the additional information as it was clearly provided to be helpful with future instruction, not to have high-stakes consequences for students. Mrs. Joseph inquired about the proposal to have separate sub-scores for the investigation and experimentation strand in the sciences.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

- **ACTION:** Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the sub-score reporting categories for the reports of results (beginning in 2002) on the California Standards Tests provided to education agencies and for individual students in accordance with the recommendations of CDE staff. Ms. Goncalves seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

ITEM 29	California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Including, but not limited to, Reclassification Guidelines.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	-----------------------

Mr. Warren summarized the objective of the guidelines: to provide good ideas to teachers and other local education officials to use in the process of reclassification. [Attachment 12.] Mr. Mockler suggested that the advice would be welcomed by local agencies because there is still uncertainty as to what the English language development levels mean in practice. He recommended a specific modification of the last paragraph to emphasize that the guidelines would be subject to change over time.

Speakers

Peter Schilla

Rose Casselman

Mr. Schilla urged the State Board to postpone action on the guidelines until it had completed action on the related regulations. Ms. Casselman expressed support for issuance of the guidelines.

- **ACTION:** Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve the reclassification guidelines as proposed by CDE staff with the incorporation of a modification related to future changes in the guidelines (as proposed by the State Board's Executive Director). Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

ITEM 30	California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Regulations.	ACTION
---------	--	--------

Item withdrawn.

ITEM 31	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not limited to, Approval of Regulations on Accommodations to go out for a 15-day Public Comment Period.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	-----------------------

Mr. Spears first informed the State Board that Education Testing Service had been awarded the contract for the CAHSEE. Next, he provided a briefing on the results of the first administration of the CAHSEE. [Attachment 13.]

Mr. Spears introduced the CDE proposed amendments to the regulations on CAHSEE accommodations. [Attachment 14.] The amendments were focused on four key ideas: (1) all

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

students must be able to participate in the CAHSEE; (2) disabled students need accommodations as necessary to access the exam; (3) English learners need to have access to additional instruction to become prepared for the exam; and (4) all students must pass the exam in English. He urged the State Board to make a decision, one way or another, today on the accommodations regulations as three statewide training sessions are soon to be held.

Ms. Belisle expressed reservations with respect to the CDE proposal. She set forth a framework for the State Board's discussion of accommodation regulations, noting the first discussion point is the determination of the "constructs" of the test (i.e., what the test purports to measure). The CDE-proposed accommodations allow for students to be read the test orally (or by a mechanical device that produces sounds), rather than reading it for themselves; and the CDE-proposed accommodations allow students to use a calculator, rather than doing the computations themselves. If the State Board determines, based on the analysis by AIR (the contractor for the initial CAHSEE) of what the test measures that reading (decoding and comprehension) and computation are constructs of the test, then the accommodations provided may not fundamentally alter or interfere with those constructs.

Ms. Belisle recommended that the integrity of the test constructs be maintained and that the individual needs of disabled pupils be addressed using the specific special education waiver provision. Based upon case-by-case review, the State Board may chose to allow public policy exceptions using the waiver process without establishing regulatory authorization for the use of accommodations that interfere with the test's constructs, e.g., by allowing the reading portion of the test to be spoken to the student (or otherwise presented in an audio format), or allowing the students to use a calculator on items designed to test the student's computational skills. She presented an alternative set of regulations for consideration. [Attachment 15.]

Mr. Mockler suggested that a statutory change – though not an immediate answer – would be the ideal way of resolving the competing objectives now set forth in law. Ms. Tacheny indicated that this is a very difficult issue; we do not wish to be mean-spirited, but we must maintain the rigor of the test. She concurred that the waiver option seemed a wiser course, as did Mrs. Joseph and Mr. Abernethy. Ms. Reynolds indicated that she, too, preferred the alternative regulatory language presented by Ms. Belisle, along with a commitment to seek a statutory change in the next legislative session. Ms. Hammer echoed that thought.

- **ACTION:** Mr. Fisher moved that the State Board approve for purposes of 15-day public review and comment (in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act) changes to the regulations on CAHSEE accommodations presented by State Board staff. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

President Hastings requested that CDE staff develop waiver guidelines for the State Board's consideration in anticipation of the possibility of the State Board approving the regulations on CAHSEE accommodations in the form to be circulated for 15-day public review and comment. If possible, a rough draft of the guidelines is to be sent out for information in the supplemental

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

mailing for the November meeting. Action on the guidelines is not anticipated prior to the December meeting.

By consensus, the State Board expressed its desire to encourage the Legislature to approve a specific statutory provision relating to the issuing of high school diplomas to students whose disabilities cannot be accommodated in the taking the CAHSEE without violating the exam's constructs, e.g., students who could only take the reading portion of the exam by having another individual (or an electronic device) speak the written words to them.

ITEM 32	General Educational Development (GED): Including, but not limited to, Proposed Changes to GED Regulations.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Mr. Spears provided a brief presentation on the proposed changes to the GED regulations. [Attachment 16.] They are being presented for information only at this meeting. They will return for action in November.

ITEM 33	Formation of Mission San Jose Unified School District from a portion of the Fremont Unified School District in Alameda County	PUBLIC HEARING ACTION
---------	---	-----------------------

School Fiscal Services Division Director Jan Sterling introduced Larry Shirey of the SFSD staff. Mr. Shirey summarized the CDE evaluation of this reorganization proposal and the reasons that CDE staff recommend that the State Board disapprove the petition. President Hastings explained that a public hearing would now be held on the petition with 30 minutes (for an initial presentation) and, subsequently, five minutes (for rebuttal) being provided to each side (proponents and opponents) to make their respective arguments. He indicated that the State Board's basic options were (1) to disapprove the petition, as recommended by CDE staff; (2) to approve the petition and set the area of election as only the territory proposed for inclusion in the new district; and (3) to approve the petition and set the area of election as the whole of the existing Fremont Unified School District. Approval of the petition is contingent on the State Board finding that the criteria set forth in statute (Education Code Section 35753) have been "substantially met," although the State Board may grant an exception if (1) it is not practical or possible to apply the criteria literally and (2) the petition provides an exceptional situation sufficient to justify approval.

Public Hearing Call to Order. 2:24 p.m.

Speakers in favor of the petition

Bruce Funk
Joel Kirschenstein
Thomasina Reed
Daniel Wong
Jeff Jaycox
Cynthia Lee
Tami Wong

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

Maurice Rumaya
Robert Nakamae
Herb Chu
Trish Kersell
Lepis Salvanis
John Caruso
Nellie Asauko
Bernie Hoffman

Speakers in opposition to the petition

Gus Morrison
Guy Emanuele
Terry Brennan
Susan Blincoe
Lowell Shira
Jean Faust
Sharon Belsaw Jones
Aidan Ali-Sullivan
Greg Bonaccorsi
Nina Moore
Carol Ann KochWeser
Debra Pearson
Gail Jones
Jim Roymohn
Curtis Washington

Public Hearing Adjournment. 3:44 p.m.

Following the public hearing, there was considerable discussion by the State Board members. Superintendent Eastin indicated her support of the CDE staff recommendation to disapprove the petition. She has great respect for both sides and understands their arguments. She feels that alternatives to breaking up the district should be explored, such as the creation of trustee areas for the election of governing board members in the Fremont Unified School District.

Ms. Tacheny indicated that she was having difficulty understanding the motivation to establish a separate district and that she was not convinced that this petition satisfied all of the criteria set forth in law. Ms. Hammer indicated that she had met with the petitioners in advance of the meeting and had a great deal of respect for them, but that she, too, did not see a compelling need for the reorganization. Moreover, she felt that the petition failed to meet certain criteria. If the matter were to proceed to a vote in the local area, Ms. Hammer indicated that she would support holding the vote in the whole district. Ms. Reynolds indicated that, despite the obvious enthusiasm of the proponents, she was not convinced that all of the criteria had been met; moreover, she felt that the proposed district, if created, might be a “privileged enclave” and, thus, inconsistent with the objectives of public education.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

Ms. Goncalves expressed concern that creation of the proposed district would promote racial isolation, even though CDE staff did not indicate that this was a concern. Mrs. Joseph indicated that the Fremont Unified School District is an excellent district in her view, and that the new district, if created, could adversely affect the district's ability to sustain the quality of its educational programs; therefore, the petition did not meet all of the criteria for approval in her opinion. Mr. Fisher commented that he, too, felt the creation of a new district would have an adverse impact on the existing district's ability to maintain financial stability and the quality of its educational program. Mrs. Ichinaga expressed regret that this matter had apparently become divisive in the Fremont area. She expressed hope that the two sides would come together and work cooperatively; diversity is very important to the public schools. Ms. Tacheny indicated that the discussion had convinced her that the petition did not satisfy all of the criteria for approval; creation of the proposed district would be detrimental to educational programs in the existing district.

President Hastings expressed appreciation to all who presented information and arguments to the State Board.

- ACTION: Ms. Reynolds moved that the State Board disapprove the petition to form a new unified school district from the Mission San Jose area of the Fremont Unified School District in Alameda County by adoption of the resolution to that effect prepared by CDE staff. Mrs. Joseph seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Abernethy was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 34	Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching (PAEMST).	INFORMATION
---------	--	-------------

[This item was taken up following Item 27, at approximately 11:30 a.m., and was followed by the lunch recess.]

The State Board recognized and honored the following teachers. Superintendent Eastin provided introductory remarks about each teacher, in turn, and each teacher introduced the family and supporters who had accompanied them. President Hastings presented a plaque to each teacher, and photographs were taken.

2000 PRESIDENTIAL AWARDEES

Elementary Mathematics

SANDY HINDY

Oak Hills Elementary School

Oak Park Unified School District

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

Secondary Mathematics

SANDRA GILLIAM

San Lorenzo Valley High School

San Lorenzo Valley Unified School District

Secondary Science

JENNIFER FONG

Mission High School

San Francisco Unified School District

2001 CALIFORNIA STATE FINALISTS

Elementary Mathematics

LEANNA BAKER

Treeview Elementary School/Bidwell Campus

Hayward Unified School District

Elementary Mathematics

STEPHANIE PENNIMAN

Plummer Street Elementary School

Los Angeles Unified School District

Elementary Mathematics

LINDA MOFFATT

Canyon Middle School

Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School District

Secondary Mathematics

MERCEDITA DEL ROSARIO

Highland High School

Kern Union High School District

Secondary Mathematics

PAM MASON

Patrick Henry Middle School

Los Angeles Unified School District

Secondary Mathematics

CHRISTOPHER SHORE

Temecula Valley High School

Temecula Valley Unified School District

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
October 10-11, 2001

Elementary Science

PAUL KILLIAN

Leal Elementary School

ABC Unified School District

Elementary Science

JULIE TAYLOR

Desert Trails Elementary School

Adelanto Elementary School District

Elementary Science

MARY LOUISE WOOLF

Roosevelt Elementary School

Central Unified School District

Secondary Science

TOBY MANZANARES

Montebello/Futures High School

Montebello Unified School District

Secondary Science

PAMELA MILLER

Seaside High School

Monterey Peninsula Unified School District

Secondary Science

LARRY NORDELL

Mount Miguel High School

Grossmont Union High School District

Adjournment of Meeting

President Hastings adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Greg Geeting

Assistant Executive Director

16 Attachments